

**R E M A R K S**

**I. Introduction**

In response to the Office Action August 7, 2006, Applicants have amended claims 1 and 2 to incorporate the limitations of claims 3 and 4 and to overcome the § 112 rejections. Support for the amendments to claims 1 and 2 may be found, for example, on page 8, lines 1-22. Claims 3 and 4 have been cancelled, without prejudice. In addition, the specification has been amended to correct informalities and to define the acronyms representing the resin materials. No new matter has been added.

For the reasons set forth below, Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims are patentable over the cited prior art references.

**II. The Rejection Of Claims 1-4 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 1-4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miyamoto et al. (USP No. 6,744,895) in view of Han et al. (US 2002/0071590). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections for at least the following reasons.

With regard to the present invention, amended claims 1 and 2 recite, in-part, a loudspeaker comprising: a hollow frame having opening sections at its upper side and lower side wherein the frame is integrated with an outer peripheral part of a connected-component which is formed by coupling the yoke with the first magnet and the first plate, and at least one of an upper surface of the yoke and a lower surface thereof is integrated as a reference plane in mounting for a mold of the frame, wherein an internal-accuracy between one of the first diaphragm or second diaphragm coupled with one opening side of the frame and the yoke is improved in comparison to the other of the first diaphragm or second diaphragm.

One feature of the present invention lies in that at least one of an upper surface of the yoke and a lower surface thereon is integrated as a reference plane in mounting for a mold of the frame. Fig. 3 shows a mounting surface of yoke 3A for a mold of frame 1D is set as a reference plane in insert-molding. As is described in the specification on page 8, lines 7-16:

“...in a case where a lower surface of yoke 3A is a mounting surface for a mold of frame 1D, an interval between second diaphragm 11 and the yoke only depends on assembling-accuracy of the mold of frame 1D. On the other hand, an interval between first diaphragm 9 and yoke 3A depends on assembling-accuracy of the mold of frame 1D and variations in a board thickness of yoke 3A. In a loudspeaker which is employed as a receiver used by making the operator's ear close to the receiver, the operator recognizes variations in sound-pressure frequency characteristics. Therefore, such a problem can be avoided by using the loudspeaker of a side of second diaphragm 11 as a receiver.”

As a result of the above-cited limitation, one side of the loudspeaker is more stable than the other side of the loudspeaker in terms of sound-pressure frequency characteristics. Neither Miyamoto, nor Han disclose this feature of the present invention.

In order to establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Royka*, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA1974). As Miyamoto and Han, at a minimum, fail to describe a loudspeaker comprising: a hollow frame having opening sections at its upper side and lower side wherein the frame is integrated with an outer peripheral part of a connected-component which is formed by coupling the yoke with the first magnet and the first plate, and at least one of an upper surface of the yoke and a lower surface thereof is integrated as a reference plane in mounting for a mold of the

frame, wherein an internal-accuracy between one of the first diaphragm or second diaphragm coupled with one opening side of the frame and the yoke is improved in comparison to the other of the first diaphragm or second diaphragm, it is submitted that Miyamoto, alone or in combination with Han, does not render claims 1 and 2 obvious. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the § 103 rejection of claims 1 and 2 be withdrawn.

**III. Conclusion**

Having fully responded to all matters raised in the Office Action, Applicants submit that all claims are in condition for allowance, an indication of which is respectfully solicited.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 500417 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP

Michael E. Fogarty  
Registration No. 36,139

Please recognize our Customer No. 20277  
as our correspondence address.

600 13<sup>th</sup> Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20005-3096  
Phone: 202.756.8000 MEF/NDM:kap  
Facsimile: 202.756.8087  
**Date: November 7, 2006**